

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 8, 10-17, 22, 27, 33, 39, 42-50, 55-58, 63-66, 69-74, and 79-81 are pending. No claim amendments have been made herein.

Claims 1-5, 8, 10-17, 22, 27, 33, 39, 42-50, 55-58, 63-66, 69-74, and 79-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,221,838 to Gutman (“Gutman”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,737 to Daggar (“Daggar”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,563,393 to Coutts (“Coutts”) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,603,078 to Henderson et al. (“Henderson”).

Claim 1 was previously amended to recite “wherein the self-service transaction terminal is programmed to present a sequence of selection screens for a transaction related to the transaction information entered by the user on the hand-held computing device, wherein the hand-held computing device is programmed to skip the presentation of at least some of the selection screens of the sequence, and wherein communicating the transaction information further comprises skipping the presentation of said at least some of the selection screens of the sequence by the hand-held computing device according to said program.” Claim 63 was similarly amended.

In this Non-Final Office Action, the Examiner does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to these claim limitations that were entered upon amendment in a Request for Continued Examination. “If the examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness.” MPEP 2142. Further, “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Further, none of the cited references teach this claimed feature, as explained in the Remarks/Argument of the Request for Continued Examination:

There likewise no hint of teaching or suggestion in Gutman, Daggar, and/or Coutts of “wherein the self-service transaction terminal is programmed to present a sequence of selection screens for a transaction related to the transaction information entered by the user on the hand-held computing device, wherein the hand-held computing device is programmed to skip the presentation of at least some of the selection screens of the sequence, and wherein communicating the transaction information further comprises skipping the presentation of said at least some of the selection screens of the sequence by the hand-held computing device according to said program”, as also recited in amended independent claims 1, and similarly in amended independent claim 63.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 63 are believed to be allowable.

Because claims 1 and 63 are believed to be allowable, claims 2-5, 8, 10-17, 22, 27, 33, 39, 42-50, 55-58, 64-66, 69-74, and 79-81 are also believed to be allowable as they depend on claims 1 and 63. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

The undersigned representative respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution might be advanced by discussing the application with the undersigned representative, in person or over the telephone, we welcome the opportunity to do so. In addition, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to Deposit Account 19-3140.

Dated: December 29, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Eric Sophir, Reg. No. 48,499/

Eric Sophir  
Registration No. 48,499  
SNR Denton US LLP  
1301 K Street, NW  
Suite 600, East Tower  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 408-6470